

Appl. No. 10/695,187
Amtd. Dated November 10, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 10, 2005

Docket No. IS01207AP
Customer No. 22917

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-7 and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reynolds (USPN 3,580,462) in view of Carlomango (USPN 5,143,272). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reynolds and Carlomango as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Matu (JP 52-42447). Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reynolds and Carlomango as applied to claim 9 and further in view of Matu. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. However, to move the case forward, Applicants file amendments to the claims for the Examiner's consideration. Further, Applicants confirm that they would like to prosecute Claims 1-14 as mentioned in a telephone conversation on 1 June 2005 between Tom Miller and Examiner Johnson.

In this amendment, every claim in the Applicants' application has been amended to clarify the invention. Specifically, amendments have been added to limit the claims to "wicking excess solder ... by capillary action" and to a "substrate ... [comprising] vias." Support for the new limitations is found in a number of places in Applicants' specification. For example, FIG.3 shows vias 32 and the description on page 8 mentions that the wicking action is a capillary action. As such, no new matter is added by the amendments.

None of the cited art teaches or suggests the claims (as amended). Specifically, the Reynolds reference is missing these limitations. For example, Reynolds is limited to a wicking away solder in a *single plane* and is limited to the amount of solder that can be removed by a single, solder wettable pad. In contrast, Applicants' claimed invention requires "vias." Further, Carlomango is missing these limitations. Specifically, Carlomango uses vacuum to draw solder off. As is known to one of ordinary skill in the art, the use of vacuum to remove excess solder may cause damage to the circuit board. In contrast, Applicants' claimed invention requires "wicking excess solder by capillary action."

Since, Reynolds fails to teach Applicants' claims as amended, Reynolds in combination with any other reference also fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claims. Further, since

Appl. No. 10/695,187
Amdt. Dated November 10, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 10, 2005

Docket No. IS01207AP
Customer No. 22917

Carlomango fails to teach Applicants' claims as amended, Carlomango in combination with any other reference also fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claims. Thus, the rejections with Reynolds in combination with Carlomango and/or Maru should be withdrawn.


The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants. Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
1303 East Algonquin Road
IL01/3rd Floor
Schaumburg, IL 60196
Customer Number: 22917

By:



Indira Saladi
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 45,759

Telephone: 847-576-6735
Fax No.: 847-576-0721

Attachments